

Notes on Sumerian Expression of “Humility” in Royal Inscriptions,
and on the Calculations of Days in Administrative TextsNotes on Sumerian Expression of “Humility”
in Royal Inscriptions, and on the Calculations
of Days in Administrative Texts*

Tohru MAEDA

I Expression of Humility in Early Dynastic Royal Inscriptions

In early dynastic royal inscriptions, there are cases of the Sumerian verbs *a~ru* “to dedicate” and *kiri₄ šu ~gál* “to pray” taking the verbal infix *-ši/šè-* which corresponds grammatically to *-šè-* of *nam-ti—šè* “for (—) life” in the nominal phrase. This brief paper shows that the presence of infix *-ši/šè-* connotes the dedicator’s sense of humility. These phrases expressed something equivalent to “I, the underling, cannot claim to pray to the god for the long life of my lord, in place of my lord himself. But I dare to do so.”

First, I will examine the relationship between the dedicators and those whose long lives they made the dedication for in passages in which *a~ru* appeared. Likewise, in the passages with *kiri₄ šu ~gál*, I will examine the relationship between those offering prayers and the gods to whom they prayed.

a~ru

1) ABW 1, En 1, 19

1) ^dnin-gir-su, 2) é-ninnu-ra, 3) en-an-na-túm, 4) énsi, 5) lagaš^{ki}-ka, 6) guruš-a-ni, 7) bára-ki-bad, 8) sukkal-le, 9) nam-ti, 10) lugal-ni, 11) en-an-na-túm-ma-šè, 12) a mu-na-šè-ru

“To the god Ningirsu of Eninnu-temple; (For) Enannatum, ruler (ensi) of Lagash; His subject, Barakibad, sukkal, dedicated this (mace head) for the life of Enannatum, his lord.”

Barakibad made the dedication not for his own life, but for the long life of Enannatum, ruler (ensi) of Lagash. In the cases in which a person dedicated something for his own life (*nam-ti-la-ni-šè*), the verbal infix *-ši/šè-* did not appear (*nam-ti-la-ni-šè a mu-na-ru*: ABW 1.2; En.I 18, AnLag 2, Lukin 2, Lukin 4, Lukis 1, Luzag 1, AnEshn. 1, AnUr 18, AnUr 22, AnUruk 2).

Barakibad, who fulfilled the duty of sukkal for Enannatum, ruler of Lagash, inserted the

words, “his (Enannatum’s) subject (guruš-a-ni),” and “(Enannatum was) his lord (lugal-a-ni)” to stress that he submitted himself to his lord. This expression of his inferior status would mean something close to “I am humble, so I will bring contempt upon myself when I make a votive offering for the long life of Enannatum, my lord. But I dare to do this with humility. The god Ningirsu, please notice my votive offering.”

In two Ur inscriptions, the subjects of A’annepada, the king of Ur, made dedications to the gods for their king’s life.

2) ABW 2, Ur Aan 5

1) ^dnin-a-zu₆, 2) lú-du₁₀-ga, 3) nam-ti, 4) a-an-né-pà-da-šè, 5) a mu-na-šè-ru

“To the goddess Ninazu, Luduga dedicated it for the life of A’annepada [king of Ur].”

3) ABW 2, Ur: Aan 3, 4’-6’

1’) in-dù-a, 2’) ^{giš}gígir-ré, 3’) mu-na-il, 4’) nam-ti a-an-né-pà-da-šè, 5’) KA-zi-^dnanna-ur-sag, 6’) a mu-na-šè-ru

“(When the temple) was built, he brought a chariot (into the temple). For the life of A’annepada [king of Ur], KAzi-Nanna-ur-sag dedicated it (to the god)”

In both inscriptions, it is certain that the two dedicators were subjects of A’annepada, king of Ur, although they did not indicate their occupation, or their relationship to the king. The infix -šì- connoted their humble feeling.

There is an inscription which recorded that a woman made a dedication for her long life and for the long lives of her children.

4) ABW 2, AnUr 16

1) ^dama-geštin-ra, 2) nin-nam, 3) dam é-xx-ke₄, 4) nam-ti-la-ni-šè, 5) nam<-ti> dumu-na-šè, 6) a mu-na-šì-ru

“To the goddess Amageshtinna, Ninnam, the wife of E-xx, dedicated it for her own life and for the life of her children.”

Ninnam refers to herself as “the wife of E-xx.” The infix -šì- appeared when the dedicator was someone’s wife. However, unlike the case of a wife’s dedication, when the father or husband made a dedication to a god for his own long life and the long life of his family, inscriptions never contained the infix -šì-, as in the following inscriptions (see, also ABW 2, AnNip. 2, 3, 8, 9, 60, AnSippar 3).

4-1’) ABW 2, AnNip. 6

1) ^dnin-líl, 2) ^den-líl-lá, 3) dumu ad-da-ke₄, 4) ga-ti-la-šè, 5) nam-ti, 6) dam-dumu-na-šè, 7) a

mu-na-ru

“To the god Enlil, Enlilda, son of Adda, dedicated it for his own life and for the lives of his wife and children.”

4-2') ABW 2, AnEšn. 1

1') [nam-t]i-la-ni-šè, 2') nam-ti dam-dumu-ne-ne-šè, 3') a mu-na-ru

“He dedicated it for his own long life and for the lives of his wife and children (to a god).”

Generally speaking, in ancient society, a wife was under the authority of the patriarch. The wife, who was inferior in social status to her husband, would hesitate to make a votive offering for her family in place of her husband whose main duty was the protection of his family. She would feel that her act showed a kind of arrogance. In this case, the infix -ši- connoted her humble feeling.

kiri₄ šu ~gál

Thus for I have examined cases in which the Sumerian verb a~ru took the infix -ši-. Next, I will examine some cases in which the verb kiri₄ šu ~gál also took the infix -ši-.

5) ABW 1, Ent 16

i 1) ^dnin-gír-sú, 2) ur-sag ^den-líl-ra, 3) en-TE.ME-na, 4) énsi, 5) lagaš^{ki}-ke₄, 6) dumu en-an-na-túm, 7) énsi, 8) lagaš^{ki}-ka-ke₄, 9) é-gal an-ta-sur-ra, ii 1) ^dnin-gír-sú-ra, 2) mu-na-dù,—, 8) u₄-ba, iii 1) ir₁₁-da-ni, 2) du-du, 3) sanga ^dnin-gír-sú-ka-ke₄, 4) [b]àd-da-sal₄ 5) gú-edin-na-ka, 6) mu-dù, 7) é-igi-il-edin-na, 8) mu mu-na-sa₄, 9) bàd kar-má-addir_x, 10) gír-sú^{ki}-ka, iv 1) mu-dù, 2) en-zi-šà-gál, 3) mu mu-na-sa₄, 4) dingir-ra-ni, 5) ^dšul-utul₁₂, 6) nam-ti-la-ni-šè, 7) ^dnin-gír-sú-ra, 8) é-ninnu-a, 9) kiri₄ šu hé-na-šè-gál

“For the god Ningirsu, the hero of Enlil; Enmetena, ruler of Lagash, son of Enannatum, ruler of Lagash, built the Egal of Antasurra for the god Ningirsu. —.”

“At that time, his (Enannatum's) slave, Dudu, sanga-priest of Ningirsu, built the Dasal-wall of Gu'edinna, and named it ‘the temple which was watching the edin.’ He (Dudu) built the karma'addir-wall of Girsu, and named it ‘the en-priest for every creature.’ (Dudu asked) his (Enannatum's) personal god Shulutul to pray for his (Enannatum's) life (to the god Ningirsu) in the Eninnu-temple.”

Dudu, the sanga-priest of the god Ningirsu, wished to pray to the god Ningirsu for Enannatum's long life. In this inscription, Dudu clearly asserted that he was “his (Enannatum's) slave”

to stress his subordination to Enannatum, ruler of Lagash. The infix -ši- connoted Dudu's modest attitude.

6) ABW 1, En 1 20

i 1) ^dlugal-URUxKÁR^{ki}-ra, 2) ir₁₁-kala-ga-ni, 3) en-an-na-túm, 4) énsi, 5) lagaš^{ki}-ke₄, 6) dumu a-kur-gal, 7) énsi, 8) lagaš^{ki}-ka-ke₄, —. iii 2) u₄-ba, 3) en-an-na-túm-me, 4) ganunmah, 5) URUxKÁR^{ki}-ba, 6) mu-dù, 7) nam-ti-la-ni-šè, 8) ^dlugal-URUxKÁR^{ki}-ra, 9) é-gal URUxKÁR^{ki}-ka, 10) kiri₄ šu hé-na-šè-gál

“For the god Lugalurub, his strong slave, Enannatum, ruler of Lagash, son of Akurgal, ruler of Lagash, —. At that time, Enannatum built the ganunmah in Urub, and he asked him (Shulutul, Enannatum's personal god) to pray for his own life to the god Lugalurub in Egal of Urub.”

In this inscription, Enannatum prayed for his own long life. Generally dedicator prayed for his own life, the infix -ši- did not usually appear. However, the infix -ši- appeared in this inscription. It is possible to explain the appearance of the infix -ši- in the following way.

Enannatum introduced himself as “his (the god Lugalurub) strong slave.” He stressed that the god Lugalurub was his master, and that he was subject to the god. Since he proclaimed his inferior relationship to the god, the infix -ši- appeared, connoting the prayer's modest attitude to the god.

In the following inscription Enannatum also prayed for his own long life.

7) ABW 1, En I 35

i 1) ^dinanna, 2) nin-kur-kur-ra, —. iii 6) en-an-na-tum₂, 7) lu₂ inim-ma-sè-ga, 8) ^dinanna-ka, 9) dingir-ra-ni, 10) ^dšul-utul₁₂, iv 1) nam-ti, 2) en-an-na-túm, 3) énsi, 4) lagaš^{ki}-ka-šè, 5) u₄-ul-la-šè, 6) ^dinanna-ra, 7) ib-gal-la, 8) kiri₄ šu hé-na-šè-gál, v 1) u₄-ul-pa-è-a, 2) énsi-bi, 3) ku-li-mu hé,

“For the goddess Inanna, the queen of all the lands; —. Enannatum, he who obeyed the command of the goddess Inanna, (asked) his personal god Shulutul to pray eternally for the life of Enannatum, ruler of Lagash, to the goddess Inanna in the Ibgal-temple. “The man who made it forever resplendent, that ruler is indeed my friend.”

In this inscription, Enannatum prayed for his own life to the goddess Inanna. Enannatum introduced himself as “he who obeyed the command of the goddess Innana,” in place of “his slave” which he used to introduce himself to the god Lugalurub in the previous inscription (no. 6). It is certain that the phrase “the one who obeyed the command of the god Inanna” implied the same idea of “his slave,” because a slave obeyed his master's commands. The infix -ši-

expressed the prayer’s humble feeling to the goddess Inanna to whom he prayed.

To summarize, we can say that the Sumerian verbs *a~ru* and *kiri₄ šu ~gál* took the infix *-ši-*, when those making the dedication or prayers announced that they were subordinate to the persons for whom they made the dedication, or they were subordinate to the gods to whom they prayed. The infix *-ši-* connoted the modest attitude of the dedicators and those praying.

I now turn to an examination of inscriptions in which part of the verbal section is not visible.

8) ABW 1, En 1 26

i 1) [^dlugal-URUxKÁR^{ki}], 2) [^dama-ušumgal]-an-na-ra, 3) me-an-né-[si], 4) [dumu] en-an-[na-túm], 5) [énsi], 6) [lagaš^{ki}-ka-ke₄], —, ii 6) [alan]-ni, mu-tu, 7) ^dlugal-URUxKÁR^{ki}-ra, 8) é-a mu-na-ni-túm, 9) nam-ti ab-ba-ni, 10) en-an-na-túm-ma-šè, 11) nam-ti ama-ni, 12) a-ŠU. ME.EREN-šè, 13) nam-ti-la-ni-šè, 14) ^dlugal-URUxKÁR^{ki}-[ra], 15) [é-gal URUxKÁR^{ki}-ka], 16) [kiri₄ šu hé-na-šè-gál]

“For the god Lugalurub-Amaushumgalanna, Meannesi, son of Enannatum, ruler of Lagash, —.”

“He (Meannesi) fashioned his statue, and set it up in the temple for the god Lugalurub. He asked this statue to pray to the god Lugalurub in the Egal of Urub for the life of his father, Enannatum, for the life of his mother, Ashume’erin, and for his own life.”

Meannesi, son of Enannatum, ruler of Lagash, wished that his father and mother to live long. In this inscription, part of the verbal section is not visible. Steible, the author of ABW, restored this part (ii 16) as [kiri₄ šu hé-na-šè-gál]. Based on my interpretation of the infix *-ši-*, I would agree with this insertion. The infix *-ši-* was placed in the verbal chain because it connoted Meannesi’s humble feeling to his father and mother for whom he made the dedication.

9) ABW 2, 301-2: Lukin 3

1) ^dnanna, 2) a-nu-zu, 3) dam-gâr-ra, 4) [nam-ti], 5) [lugal-k]i-ni-éš-du₇-du₇, 6) lugal KI[Š^{ki}]-a, 7) nam-ti, 8) nin-bànda-šè, 9) nam-ti, 10) lugal-kisal-[si-šè], 11) a m[u-na-ši-ru]

“To the god Nanna, Anuzu, merchant, dedicated it for the life of Lugalkinshedudu, king of Kish, for the life of Ninbanda, and for the life of Lugalkisalsi.”

This inscription recorded that Anuzu, a merchant, made the dedication to the god Nanna for the life of the king and the king’s family.

Steible restored this verbal section as “a m[u-(na-)-ru].” However, Anuzu, merchant, was undoubtedly subordinate to the royal family for whose long lives he made the dedication. Undoubtedly the verbal section would have been “a m[u-na-ši-ru].”

II On the Ur III Calendar

1) u₄-dè-gíd-da in Umma and itu-dè-lá-a in Lagash

1)-1 u₄-dè-gíd-da

Sumerian scribes in the Ur III period used a “simple calendar” to record yearly administrative-economic activities on clay tablets. I am using the phrase “simple calendar” here to mean the calendar in which every month has the same 30 days, with 360 days in a common year (12 months with 30 days each) and 390 days in a leap year (13 months with 30 days each). The simple calendar differs from the lunar calendar, which comprises not only months with 30 days, but also months with 29 days. Scribes in Ur III Umma applied the u₄-dè-gíd-da, which meant “days in the simple calendar exceeding the lunar year”, to bridge the discrepancy between the simple calendar and the lunar calendar.

Scribes estimated the amount of regular offerings (sá-dug₄ etc.) beforehand on the assumption that all the months had the same 30 days. But the lunar year had months which ended at the 29th day; that is, some months did not have the 30th day. Delivery was not necessary on that day, which was called u₄-dè-gíd-da. The amounts of material (barley, flour, etc.) for the u₄-dè-gíd-da remained and the balance was brought forward to the account of the next year. Based on the characteristics of u₄-dè-gíd-da, we can see that u₄-dè-gíd-da would be a useful tool for reconstructing the years of the lunar calendar in Ur III Umma.

I will examine some examples of u₄-dè-gíd-da.

MVN 14, 570 (SS 3 Umma i-xiii)

20 udu-niga, šà-gal	20 barley fattened sheep, fodder was
u ₄ -1-a-bi 10 (sila)-ta	10 sila of barley for a day,
itu-12 u ₄ -24-šè,	(total) 12 months and 24 days (=384 days),
še-bi 124.0. gur	total amount of barley was 12 gur 240 sila (= 3840 sila),
itu-še-ŠE.KIN-ku ₅ -ta itu-diri-šè	from the 1st month to the 13th month,
šà-gal udu-niga-	(this was) fodder for barley fattened sheep
sá-dug ₄ - ^d šára a-pi ₄ -sal ₄ ^{ki}	for the regular offering to the god Šara in Apisal,
ki uš-mu-ta DUB ur-e ₁₁ -e	(delivered) from Ušmu, sealings of Uree,
mu si-ma-núm ^{ki} ba-hul	the 3rd year of Šu-Sin,
šá-ba u ₄ -dè-gíd-da	in the period, there were
u ₄ -6-àm ì-in-gál	6 days of u ₄ -dè-gíd-da.

MVN 14,570 shows that in the 3rd year of Šu-Sin, the Umma calendar had an intercalary month (“from the 1st month to the 13th month” [itu-še-ŠE.KIN-ku₅-ta itu-diri-šè]), and the year was estimated to have 390 days (30 days x 13 months). Delivery for 390 days was prepared. However, in that year, barley for sheep fodder was delivered for “12 months and 24 days = 384 days (itu-12 u₄-24-šè)”. 384 days a year were clearly the days of the lunar leap year. The lunar year was 6 days less than the 390 days of the simple calendar. This period, shortened by 6 days, was expressed as “in the period of time, there were 6 days of u₄-dè-gíd-da, [šá-ba u₄-dè-gíd-da u₄-6-àm ì-in-gál.]”. This meant there were 6 months with 29 days in the Umma lunar calendar of the 3rd year of Šu-Sin. Therefore, the Umma calendar in the 3rd year of Šu-Sin consisted of 6 months with 29 days each and 7 months with 30 days each. There was a total of 384 days in the year.

MVN 20, 108 (SS 2 Umma)

5.4.3. eša gur	5 gur 270 sila (=1770 sila) of eša-flour,
8.4.1. 5 sila dabin gur	8 gur 255 sila (=2655 sila) of barley flour,
gaba-ta gi ₄ -a ^d šára umma ^{ki}	— of Šara in Umma,
itu-12-kam	for 12 months (= 30 days x12 =360 days),
u ₄ -dè-gíd-da u ₄ -6-kam ìb-ta-zi	6 days of u ₄ -dè-gíd-da were subtracted (from 360 days of the simple calendar),
mu má- ^d en-ki ba-ab-du ₈	the 2nd year of Šu-Sin.

There were 6 days of u₄-dè-gíd-da in the 2nd year of Šu-Sin. The simple calendar had 360 days (30 days x 12 months=360 days). Delivery was made for the 360 days minus 6 days of u₄-dè-gíd-da, that is, 354 days. This result was confirmed by calculating the amount of flour.

eša: 1770 sila = 5 sila x 354 (days)

dabin: 2655 sila = 7 1/2 sila x 354 (days)

AAICAB 1, 1911-233 (SS 4 Umma)

[], 9.0.0. gur? ? [], 7.0.0. gur ki šeš-kal?-[]-ta, 3.0.0. zíz gur ki ur-[]-ta
3.3.0. zíd eša ninda ní-g-gál-la itu-še-KIN-ta? itu-^ddumu-zi-šè, 0.3.0. 9 sila u₄-dè-gíd-da u₄-6-kam
šu.nigin 46.3.5. 9 sila še gur, šà-bi-ta
40.0.2. 2 sila še gur, sá-dug₄ itu-12-kam, 0.3.0. še-ba nar-zi itu-šu-numun, 0.4.0. še-ba ama-ha-ma-ti
0.4.0. še-ba ^dnin-ur₄-ra-ama-mu, itu-é-itu-6-šè [], [], [mu ^d]šu-^dsuen lugal [bàd mar]-tu

mu-dù

There were 6 days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da (u_4 -dè-gíd-da u_4 -6-kam). The barley for the days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da in the previous year (the 3rd year of Šu-Sin) was not delivered and this balance was brought forward to the next year (the 4th year of Šu-Sin). There were 6 days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da in the 3rd year of Šu-Sin. That is, the 3rd year of Šu-Sin had six 29-day months and seven 30-day months as noted above.

TIM 6, 52 (IS 2 Umma)

[]

? 0.0.1. 7 $\frac{2}{3}$ sila 5[+], [itu?[-1-a-kam, itu-12-še, še-bi 21.1.3. gur

0.1.4. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila še, u_4 -dè-gíd-da u_4 -6-kam, zi-zi-dam

20.4.4. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila gur, a-gù gu-du-du ba-a-gar

ša? ša-gal hé-dab₅, ša im níg-ha-la []

[mu] en-^dinanna [] máš-e i-[pà]

There were also 6 days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da. The amount of barley for the 12 months was 21.1.3. gur (21 gur 90 sila = 6390 sila). This figure indicates that they estimated 17 $\frac{1}{4}$ sila of barley per day for a total of 360 days (17 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 360 = 6390). The 106 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila (0.1.4. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila) of barley were for the days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da, which can be calculated as 17 $\frac{1}{4}$ sila x 6 days.

The barley for the 6 days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da was subtracted from the amount of 21 gur 90 sila of barley. This barley was not delivered, and the balance was brought forward to the next year. Gududu received the rest of the barley and added it to his own account (20.4.4. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila gur [=20 gur 283 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila]), a-gù gu-du-du ba-a-gar: 21 gur 90 sila minus 106 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila is 20 gur 283 $\frac{1}{2}$ sila).

TPTS 271 (AS 9 Umma ii v xi)

0.2.2. 4 sila še-kaš-gig-du, u_4 -dè-gíd-da, u_4 -3-kam, itu-sig₄-giš-i-šub-ba, itu-RI, ù itu-pa₅-ú-e,
ki lú-^dnin-šubur-ta, lú-bal-sig₅ su-su-dam, mu en-^dinanna ga-eš^{ki} ba-hun

There were 3 days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da. In this text, the three 29-day months were described clearly, for example, as itu-sig₄-giš-i-šub-ba: the 2nd month, itu-RI: the 5th month, and itu-pa₅-ú-e: the 11th month. Also the 8th and the 10th months were possibly included in the 29-day months (MVN 1, 1: viii 29. PIOL 19, 118: x 29?).

144 sila (0.2.2. 4 sila) of barley for the days of u_4 -dè-gíd-da were undelivered, since the three months did not have the 30th day. Lubalsig was obligated to give back the amount of barley to

Lu-Ninšubur from whom the barley had previously been delivered (ki lú-^dnin-šubur-ta, lú-bal-sig₅ su-su-dam).

According to the texts cited above, we can be certain that in the Umma calendar a common year had six 30-day months and six 29-day months, so that a year usually consisted of 354 days.

1)2 itu-dè-lá-a

Itu-dè-lá-a in Lagash texts, translated literally as “the day removed from a month,” functions the same as u₄-dè-gíd-da in Umma texts, that is, it bridges the discrepancy between the simple calendar and the lunar calendar. Scribes estimated the delivery according to the simple calendar. However, in a 29-day month, the portion for the 30th day was undelivered. This balance was brought forward to the next year.

UCP 9/1, 3 (IS 1 Lagash)

0.1.0. še itu-dè-lá-a, 8.4.0. DUB a-kal-la, a-šà a-ba-al-la-ta,

0.2.0. zíz a-làl-ta x?, 5.1.0. giš.tir-gaba-a?-gíd-da,

šu.nigin 14.3.0. gur, šà-bi-ta

1.0.0. <gur> sá-dug₄, itu-1-kam itu-12-šè,še-bi 12.0.0. gur,

0.1.1. 5 sila sum?-mu, mu é-^dšára ba-dù

šu.nigin 12.1.1. 5 sila gur, zi-ga, lá-NI 2.1.4. 5 sila, níg-ŠID-ak,a-kal-la IGI.DU, mu ^di-bí-^dsuen lugal

60 sila (0.1.0.) of barley for the days of itu-dè-lá-a remained from the previous year and the balance was brought forward to this year (the 1st year of Ibbi-Sin). The text did not record the number of days in itu-dè-lá-a. However, it is possible to calculate the days. 1 gur (1.0.0. <gur> =300 sila) of barley were delivered for the regular offerings (sá-dug₄) of a month, that is, 10 sila per day (300 ÷ 30=10). The total amount of 60 sila of barley for the days of itu-dè-lá-a (0.1.0. še itu-dè-lá-a) can be calculated as 10 sila x 6 days. This result shows there were 6 days of itu-dè-lá-a. That is, the previous year (the 9th year of Šu-Sin) had 6 months with 29 days.

UCP 9/1, 2 (SS 9 Lagash)

6.3.4. 6 sila gur, šu IGI.DU, 0.1.2. 1 sila itu-dè-lá-a, 10.0.0. gur DUB-bi-a

ki lú-dingir-ra dumu ab-ba-mu-ta, 0.3.0. a-šà gán-zi-ta, šu.nigin 17.3.0. 7 sila gur

<šà-bi-ta>

1.2.3. é-an-na, 0.1.0. ur-^dasar, 1.0.0. ib-gal, 2.3.3. gur, itu-1-kam itu-6-kam-aš u₄-15-šè

še-bi 17.2.4. 5 sila gur, zi-ga, níg-ŠID-ak, en-ú é URUxKÁR^{ki}

The amount of the regular offerings (sá-dug₄) in a month was 2.3.3. gur (=810 sila). They estimated 27 sila of barley a day ($810 \div 30 = 27$). The total amount of barley for the days of itu-dè-lá-a was 0.1.2. 1 sila = 81 sila. This amount of barley can be calculated as 27 sila x 3 days. There were 3 days of itu-dè-lá-a. This text covered a period of 6 months and 15 days (itu-6-kam-aš u₄-15-šè). We can see that there were three 29-day months during this period, which gives us six 29-day months for the year.

Šu IGLIDU in the first line of the text seems to be “in the hand of IGLIDU-profession”, according to a-kal-la IGLIDU in *UCP* 9/1, 3 cited above.

UCP 9/1, 1 (IS 1 Lagash)

0.1.1. 2 sila še, itu-dè-lá-a u₄, 12.0.0. DUB níg-ú-rum, a-ba-al-la-ta,

1.1.0. zíz? a-làl-ta, 6.0.0. giš.tir-gaba-gíd-da-tam, šu.nígin 19.2.1. [2] sila gur, šà-bi-ta,

1.1.3. gur sá-dug₄, itu-1-kam itu-12-šè, še-bi 15.3.0. gur,

0.2.2. 6. sila sum-mu, mu é ^dšára ba-dù, šu.nígin 16.0.2. 6 sila gur, zi-ga, lá-NI 3.1.4. 6 sila gur níg-ŠID níg-ú-rum ki-sal₄-la, mu ^di-bí-^dsuen lugal

The regular offering (sá-dug₄) in a month was an amount of 1.1.3. gur (=390 sila). They estimated 13 sila of barley a day ($390 \div 30 = 13$). 0.1.1. 2 sila (= 72 sila) was the total amount of barley for itu-dè-lá-a which was brought forward from the account of the previous year (the 9th year of Šu-Sin) to this account (the 1st year of Ibbi-Sin). The amount of barley can be calculated as 12 sila x 6 days. In this case, the amount of barley per day differed only slightly by 1 sila in the two years. But it is certain there were six 29-day months in the 9th year of Šu-Sin.

As we saw in the case of Umma, Lagash texts also reveal that there were six 29-day months and six 30-day months in a common year of the lunar calendar, and a year usually consisted of 354 days.

2) u₄-x-kam i-im-da-gál/ im-da-gál: a unique date formula

In the Ur III economic texts, normally two formulae for the expression of days are used: 1) (itu-ta) u₄-x ba-ra-zal and 2) u₄-x-kam. As P. Steinkeller has pointed out, there is a third formula: (itu) u₄-x-kam i-im-da-gál appearing in a few cases. He commented on the date formula itu-pa₅-ú-e u₄-1-àm i-im-da-gál in AUAM 73.1042, an Umma text:

“No.89 (=AUAM 73.1042) has, instead of the regular ud x ba-zal, ‘on the x day’ (lit. the x day has passed), ud 1-àm i-im-da-gál, ‘being the first day.’ This formula is unique in the Ur III

period, but note that Sargonic texts use a similar formula $u_4 \times mu-g\acute{a}l$. Cf. F. Thureau-Dangin, ITT 1, p.8, n.7.” (Steinkeller 1989, 111 note. 345).

An Umma tablet published recently reveals the uniqueness and peculiarity of this date formula: AAICAB 1, Planche 64, Ashm. 1924-665, Rev. col.7, ll. 6-10:

I é-igi-é-e, I lú-^dnanna, itu-é-itu-6-ta, itu-ezem-^dšul-gi $u_4-5-àm$ ì-im-da-gál-šè, á-bi $u_4-60 \times 2 + 10 \times 5$ (=170)

“I Eigiee, I Lu-Nanna, from the 8th month to the day $u_4-5-àm$ ì-im-da-gál of the 10th month. Their work days were 170.”

If itu-ezem-^dšul-gi $u_4-5-àm$ ì-im-da-gál denotes the 5th day of the 10th month, their work days (á-bi) would be 130 days [= $2 \times (30 \times 2 + 5)$]. However, the number of work days was recorded as 170. This calculation must have been arrived at in the following way: two men worked for the period of two months (the 8th month and 9th month = 30×2) and 25 days (= $30 - 5$) in the 10th month [$2 \times (30 \times 2 + 25) = 170$]. This calculation shows clearly that $u_4-5-àm$ ì-im-da-gál is not the 5th day of the month, but the 25th day.

According to the text, we can interpret the meaning of (itu) $u_4-x-kam$ ì-im-da-gál as “there were (still) x days within(-da-) the month”, that is, “the day when x days remain until the end of the month”.

Curiously this new date formula counts the days in reverse, that is, from the end of the month, while normally days were counted from the beginning of the month. So the date formula (itu) $u_4-x-kam$ ì-im-da-gál is not similar to the other date formulae (itu-ta) u_4-x ba-ra-zal and $u_4-x-kam$.

The following is a chart comparing $u_4-x-kam$ and $u_4-x-àm$ ì-im-da-gál:

$u_4-x-àm$ ì-im-da-gál	$u_4 \times kam$
1	29
2	28
3	27

15	15
16	14

20	10

As we can observe from this chart, *itu-pa₅-ú-e u₄-l-àm i-im-da-gál* in AUAM 73.1042 was not the 1st day of the 11th month, but the 29th day of the 11th month. This interpretation differs from P. Steinkeller's comment quoted above. Other examples of *u₄-x-kam i-im-da-gál* are as follows:

AAICAB 1, Ashm. 1924-650 (Umma)

itu-dumu-zi, mu ^dšu^d-suen lugal-e na-rú-a-mah mu-dù-a, u₄ 20-àm im-da-gál-ta, itu-sig₄-giš. i-šub-ba gá-ra mu ^dšu^d-suen lugal-e ma-da za-ab-ša-li^{ki} mu-hul, u₄-15-àm im-da-gál-la-šè

"From the 10th day (not the 20th day) of the 12th month of Umma in the 6th year of Šu-Sin to the 15th day of the 2nd month in the 7th year of Šu-Sin." (Cf, AAICAB 1, p.103 catalogue: Date: Ur III: SS 6/ U. 12/ 20 - SS 7 2/ 15)

In this text, *im-da-gál* appeared instead of *i-im-da-gál*.

MVN 1, 254 (Umma)

I lú-ib-gal, itu-sig₄-giš.i-šub-ba gá-gar-ta, itu-šu-numun u₄-11-àm im-da-gál,

I ur-giš.gigir, itu-šu-numun-ta, itu-min-èš <u₄>-11-zal-la-aš.

"I Luibgal, from the 2nd month to the 19th day of the 6th month. I Urgigir, from the 6th month to the 11th day of the 7th month."

im-da-gál appeared instead of *i-im-da-gál*. And curiously both formulae, *u₄-x-àm in-da-gál* and *u₄-x <ba-ra->zal-la*, appeared in this text.

The date formula (*itu*) *u₄-x-kam i-im-da-gál/ im-da-gál* was used only in Umma texts, and at this point, has not been found in texts from other Sumerian cities: Lagash, Ur, Nippur, and Puzureš-Dagan.

U₄ x mu-gál in the Old Akkadian Lagash text is not similar to *u₄-x-àm i-im-da-gál*. The two formulae have the same verb *gál*, but they are grammatically different. The first has the prefix *mu-* and the other has the ventive *im-* (for *i-im-*, see Yoshikawa, 1993). Furthermore, the first one does not have the infix *-da-*, which is, I consider, the main element containing the meaning of reverse order. On the other hand, the formula *u₄ x mu-gál* is an expression for the normal counting of days from the beginning of the month, as in *itu-ta u₄-x ba-ra-zal* and *u₄-x-kam*.

Note

*Parts I and II in this paper are the English versions read at the 43rd (December 26, 2001) and the 37th (December 17, 1997) meeting of the Japanese Society for Sumerian Studies and were submitted to the *Acta*

Notes on Sumerian Expression of "Humility" in Royal Inscriptions, and on the Calculations of Days in Administrative Texts

Sumerologica (a special issue [2002] and Vol.21 [1999]). However, these volumes were never published. Although written over 15 years ago, I believe that the content is of no less value than when written originally. For this reason, I have not revised these papers for publication here.

References

- Steinkeller 1989: P. Steinkeller, *Sale Documents of the Ur-III-Period*, Stuttgart.
- Yoshikawa 1993: M. Yoshikawa, "On the Sumerian verbal prefix chains i-in-, i-ib-, and i-im-", *Studies in the Sumerian Verbal System*, Tokyo, 184-198.
- AAICAB: J.-P. Grégoire, *Archives Administratives et Inscriptions Cunéiformes de l'Ashmolean Museum et de la Boudleian Collection d'Oxford*, Paris 1996.
- ABW: H. Steible, *Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften*, Wiesbaden 1982.
- MVN 1: G. Pettinato, and H. Waetzoldt, *La collezione Schollmeyer*, 1974.
- MVN 14: F. Yildiz, et al., *Die Umrna-Texte aus den archäologischen Museen zu Istanbul*, Nr. 1-600, 1988.
- MVN 15: D.I. Owen, *Neo-Sumerian Texts from American Collections*, 1991.
- MVN 20: F. D'Agostino, *Testi Amministrativi della III Dinastia di Ur dal Museo Statale Ermitage San Pietroburgo-Russia*, 1997.
- PIOL 19: H. Sauren, *Les tablettes cunéiformes de l'époque d'Ur des collections de la New York Public Library*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 19, 1978.
- TIM 6: F. Reschid, *Administrative Texts from the Ur III Dynasty*, (Texts in the Iraq Museum 6), Bagdad, 1971.
- TPTS: M. Sigrist, *Tablettes du Princeton Theological Seminary, Époque d'Ur III*, 1-2, Philadelphia, 1990-2005.
- UCP 9/1: H.F. Lutz, "Sumerian Temple Records of the Late Ur Dynasty," *University of California Publications in Semitic Philosophy* 9 II-1/2, Berkeley 1928.